



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/786,913	02/25/2004	Bruce M. Coughlin	2003P02864 US01	5382

7590 09/04/2007
Siemens Corporation
Intellectual Property Department
170 Wood Avenue South
Iselin, NJ 08830

EXAMINER

PHAM, MICHAEL

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2167

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

09/04/2007

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/786,913

Applicant(s)

COUGHLIN ET AL.

Examiner

Michael D. Pham

Art Unit

2167

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 1-3 and 16-30.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3 and 16-30 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3 and 16-30 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

Detailed Action

Status of claims

1. Claims 1-3 and 16-30 are pending in the application.
2. Claims 1-2 are amended.
3. Claims 16-30 are new.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. **Claims 1 and 16-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Publication 2002/0123983 by Riley et. al. (hereafter Riley) further in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication 2003/0088456 by Ernst et. al. (hereafter Ernst).**

Claim 1:

Riley discloses the following claimed limitations:

“matching data elements from multiple systems in an integrated services system, wherein each of said multiple systems has a unique identifier within said integrated services system;”
[Figure 2 elements 23,25,27,29, and others (multiple systems). Figure 2, areas of application of

an organization (integrated services system). Paragraph 0105, All service requests (data elements) should be assigned a unique identification number or ticket ID (unique identifier).]

“Categorizing said matching data elements” [paragraph 0113, categorizing service requests]

“that contain information to be used to monitor and measure provided integrated services” [Paragraphs 0116, 0122, and 0172. In 0122, Figure 8, is a chart listing examples of impact of an affected process. The numbers on the chart are numerals from 1 to 5 reflecting the severity of the impact. Impact is a measure of how an incident affects the organization and user group (i.e. measure how integrating the service would impact the incident). In 0116, classifying the request against all other requests made by the service desk customers and determines the speed in which the service request should be handled. In 0172, statistics and variables tracked (i.e. monitor) may be analyzed in regard to their relation to agreed upon levels of service.]

“Generating a report” [paragraph 0172, service desk may generate reports.]

However Riley does not explicitly disclose “to create standard tables”. On the other hand, Ernst discloses on Figure 2 (standard tables), a valuation of the components of the system on a per service basis. Paragraphs 0089-0090, The table in figure 2 determines a business value (measure) and identifies each transaction of each service in which the respective component participates (monitors). Business values are used to construct table similar to that of figure 2. Ernst further discloses 0094, that A64 accumulates the data from the agents and creates the tables of figures 2 and 4 various reports regarding the value of each component in the delivery of each service, and the value of the component to the business enterprise as a whole based on multi service applicability (generating report off table).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Riley to have included the step to “create standard tables” and “generating a report based on standard tables” based on the disclosure of Ernst. Both Riley and Ernst are directed to systems attempting to reduce the cost of IT resources. One of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have been motivated to include “create standard tables” and “generating a report based on standard tables” for the purpose of providing a better tactical and business decisions [Ernst, 0094]. Thereby providing management with an improved means of lowering cost of IT resources.

Claim 16:

Riley discloses “wherein said multiple systems are host systems comprising a help desk system, a dispatch/logistics/invoicing system, a financial system and a data warehousing system.” [figure 2, elements 21 service desk (help desk), 23 sales (a dispatch/logistics/invoicing system), 27 financial (financial system), 22 central service desk repository (data warehousing system)]

Claim 17:

Riley discloses “wherein said host systems further comprise a password reset system, an acquisition data processing system, a network management system, a knowledge base system and an asset tracking system” [0029, password reset (password reset system), 0098, reports generated or data collected may be stored in central service desk repository (acquisition data

processing). 0104, knowledge databases (a knowledge base system). 0203, network management (network management), 0032, asset management (asset management)].

Claim 18:

Riley discloses “wherein data from said multiple systems are tied together in a warehousing system.”[figure 2, element 21]

Claim 19:

Riley discloses “wherein said unique identifier relates different data associated with a specific customer.”[0105, all service requests should be assigned a unique identification number or ticket ID. This number is given to the service desk customer.]

Claim 20:

Riley discloses “wherein said warehousing system categorizes said matching data elements.”
[figure 2, element 21. 0110-0111, Service request categorization is done by service desk tools.]

Claim 21:

Riley discloses “wherein said warehousing system generates said report” [abstract, service desk includes means for solving problems and incidents reports, and means for tracking and reporting service desk performance],

Riley further discloses “said method further comprising improving said monitored integrated services responsive to said information contained” [0048, improve way they deliver services to end users. This requires constant feedback and monitoring of services provided]“in said report”[abstract, track and report service desk performance]

However, “standard tables in said generated report.”

On the other hand, Ernst discloses figure 2 (standard tables), a valuation of components of the system on a per service basis. Paragraphs 0089-0090, the table in figure 2 determines a business value (measure) and identifies each transaction of each service in which the respective component participates (monitors). Business values are used to construct table similar to that of figure 2. Ernst, 0094 that A64 accumulates the data from the agents and creates the tables of figures 2 and 4 various reports regarding the value of each component in the delivery of each service, and the value of the component to the business enterprise as a whole based on multi service applicability (standard tables in said generated report)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have applied Ernst’s system of using tables for reports and making decisions based on reports to the system of Riley for the purpose of improving tactical and strategic decisions for a management system.

Claim 22:

Ernst, discloses “wherein said generated report includes real time information” [0096, real-time information].

Claim 23:

Riley discloses “wherein said generated report includes near real time information.” [0241, proactive service information in case of scheduled down time]

6. Claims 2-3 and 24-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Publication 2002/0123983 by Riley et. al. (hereafter Riley) further in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication 2003/0088456 by Ernest et. al. (hereafter Ernst) and U.S. Patent 6370544 by Krebs et. al. (hereafter Krebs).

Claim 2:

Riley discloses the following claimed limitations:

“categorizing incidents reported to a service desk,” [paragraph 0113, categorizing service requests]

“each incident being categorized by a respective host system;” [0064, 0065, 0067, 0067 discloses prioritization of incidents (each incident categorized) and requests as well as determining the types and levels of skill that will be required to staff the service desk. Figure 2, areas of application of organizations (host system)]

“utilizing said mapping data to further categorize and resolve said incidents;”[0112, before and after categorization (further categorize). 0129, resolving the service request.]

“generating reports based on data related to said categorized and/or resolved incidents;”
[paragraph 0172, service desk may generate reports.]

“mapped data being related to said categorized incidents” [0112, service request resolved and categorize incident. 0033, storing and retrieving problems and solutions for problems especially repeated and troublesome problems and incidents.]

mapped data being related to “financial information” [0033, storing and retrieving problems and solutions for problems especially repeated and troublesome problems and incidents. 0033, a finance organization utilizing service desk. 0029, service desk proactively providing relevant information to users and other parties. Hence, finance information maybe included.]

Ernst discloses the following claimed limitations:

“integrating said reports into continuous improvement programs” [abstract, usage data is prepared as reports and used in an IT workflow model to make decisions about such things as the timing of system upgrades, strategic architectural decisions, etc. Hence, in using the reports to make a decision the reports are integrated.]

Krebs discloses the following claimed limitations:

“using a bridge to map data from other host systems” [abstract, an enterprise management integration tool for providing a centralized repository for storage and processing of information related to the execution of the enterprise management functions. Further disclosing that the

interface with this database can be formed by software bridges (uses bridge) to specific management applications.]

Riley, Ernst, and Krebs are all directed to management systems that provide services. Hence all are within the same field of endeavor. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time the invention was made to have applied Ernst's disclosure of preparing reports and using it in IT workflow model to make decisions; and Krebs disclosure of providing software bridges to specific applications to Riley's method for the purpose of maximizing the overall value derived from investment technology (Ernst, 0007) and allowing for distribution of management information to organizations and personnel indirectly associated with the enterprise management system [Krebs, abstract]

Claim 3:

Ernst discloses "wherein said reports provide information associated with the costs of fixing a problem related to at least a subset of said reported incidents" [Figure 2, a valuation of the components of the system on a per service basis. Paragraphs 0089-0090, The table in figure 2 determines a business value (cost) and identifies each transaction of each service in which the respective component participates.].

Claim 24:

Riley discloses "wherein said host systems comprise a help desk system, a dispatch/logistics/invoicing system, a financial system and a data warehousing system." [figure

2, elements 21 service desk (help desk), 23 sales (a dispatch/logistics/invoicing system), 27 financial (financial system), 22 central service desk repository (data warehousing system)]

Claim 25:

Riley discloses “wherein said host systems further comprise a password reset system, an acquisition data processing system, a network management system, a knowledge base system and an asset tracking system” [0029, password reset (password reset system), 0098, reports generated or data collected may be stored in central service desk repository (acquisition data processing). 0104, knowledge databases (a knowledge base system): 0203, network management (network management), 0032, asset management (asset management)].

Claim 26:

Riley discloses “wherein a warehousing system maps said data and further categorizes and resolves said incidents” [0112, service request resolved and categorize incident. 0033, storing and retrieving problems and solutions for problems especially repeated and troublesome problems and incidents. Figure 2 element 21, warehouse system]

Claim 27:

Riley discloses “wherein said warehousing system further relates different data associated with a specific customer.” [0105, all service requests should be assigned a unique identification number or ticket ID. This number is given to the service desk customer.]

Claim 28:

Riley discloses “wherein said warehousing system generates said reports” [abstract, service desk includes means for solving problems and incidents reports, and means for tracking and reporting service desk performance],

Claim 29:

Ernst discloses “wherein said warehousing system includes real time information in said generated reports” [0096, real-time information]..

Claim 30:

Riley discloses “wherein said warehousing system includes near real time information in said generated reports.” [0241, proactive service information in case of scheduled down time]

Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's arguments filed 6/11/2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant's asserted the following (lettered) :

A. Remarks page 5 and 6. Applicants' assert that “systems in an integrated services system wherein each of said multiple systems has a unique identifier within said integration system” is not shown for claim 1.

In response, the examiner respectfully disagrees that cited references do not teach “systems in an integrated services system wherein each of said multiple systems has a unique identifier within said integration system.” Figure 2 elements 23,25,27,29, and others disclose multiple systems. Figure 2, areas of application of an organization, discloses an integrated services system. Paragraph 0105, All service requests (data elements) should be assigned a unique identification number or ticket ID (unique identifier). That this number is given to the service desk customer for future reference and tracking purposes. Hence, suggesting that each multiple system (e.g. figure 2 elements 23, 25, 27, 29, etc.) has a unique identifier within the integration system (figure 2).

B. Remarks page 5. Applicant’s assert that a host system recited in 2, 16, 17, 24, and 25 is not shown.

In response, please see claims 2, 16, 17, 24, and 25. In response, the examiner respectfully disagrees that a host system is not disclosed by the cited references. As it is clear that a host system merely provides a computer connected to some network. It is clear that Riley discloses a computer network system. Therefore, Applicant’s assertions directed towards a host system are unpersuasive.

C. Remarks page 5. Applicant’s assert that a warehousing system further categorizing data recited in 18, 20, and 26 is not shown.

In response, please see claims 2, 16, 17, 24, and 25.

D. Remarks page 5. Applicant's assert that a generating reports recited in 21 and 28 with real time information in 22 and 29.

In response, please see claims 2, 16, 17, 24, and 25.

E. Remarks page 5. Applicant's assert that a near real time information recited in 23 and 30 is not shown.

In response, please see claims 2, 16, 17, 24, and 25.

F. Neither does any record of reference teach or suggest host systems relating data associated with a specific customer as recited in claims 19 and 27.

In response, please see claims 2, 16, 17, 24, and 25.

G. An organization within the meaning of Riley specification (i.e. customers) is clearly not a system within the meaning of the present application.

In response, the examiner respectfully disagrees. As stated in 0033, the service desk may include a computer network through which customers can access assistance when seeking to resolve a problem or an incident. Figure 2, is an areas of application for a service desk. 0009, A service desk comprises a service desk computer network accessible by customers, and a system for solving problems and incidents reported by customers of the service desk. 0063, In order to communicate with the service desk system, the applications and equipment used by the user community, and the infrastructure required for their support is accessed. Hence each area of application for a service desk is a system for a user community. Therefore, applicant's arguments are unpersuasive over the cited art of reference.

Conclusion

8. The prior art made of record listed on PTO-892 and not relied, if any, upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

9. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Contact Information

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michael D. Pham whose telephone number is (571)272-3924. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday 9am - 5:00pm.


If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Cottingham can be reached on 571-272-7079. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Michael Pham
Art Unit 2167
Examiner *MP*

Cam Y. Truong
Art Unit 2162
Primary Examiner
cy

John Cottingham
Art Unit 2167
Supervisor


JOHN COTTINGHAM
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100